

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

MINNIE R. JOHNSON,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

No. 99-2431

KENNETH S. APFEL, COMMISSIONER OF
SOCIAL SECURITY,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg.
Patrick Michael Duffy, District Judge.
(CA-98-1604-5-23)

Submitted: March 31, 2000

Decided: April 21, 2000

Before NIEMEYER and MOTZ, Circuit Judges,
and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Steven Michael Calcutt, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellant.
Frank W. Hunger, Assistant Attorney General, J. Rene Josey, United
States Attorney, John Berkley Grimball, Assistant United States
Attorney, Deana R. Ertl-Lombardi, Chief Counsel, Teresa H. Abbot,
Assistant Regional Counsel, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRA-
TION, Denver, Colorado, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Minnie R. Johnson appeals from the district court's order upholding the denial of social security disability insurance benefits. We affirm.

Johnson suffers primarily from an injured back and related sciatica. After a hearing on her application for benefits, an administrative law judge ("ALJ") found that Johnson was impaired as a result of her disorders but that she was nonetheless capable of performing a full range of sedentary work. Based on this finding, the ALJ concluded that she was not eligible for disability insurance benefits. The Appeals Council upheld this determination, which became the final decision of the Commissioner. Johnson sought review of this decision in the district court, which granted summary judgment to the Commissioner. Johnson now appeals.

We find the arguments raised on appeal to be without merit. First, Johnson does not satisfy all the criteria set forth at 20 C.F.R. Part 404, Subpart P, § 1.05(c) (1999), and therefore was properly found not to be disabled at the third step of the sequential evaluation process. Second, substantial evidence supports the ALJ's finding that Johnson had no nonexertional impairments that would prevent performance of a full range of sedentary work. Accordingly, the testimony of a vocational expert was not needed, and the ALJ properly relied on the grids, which directed a finding of not disabled.

We conclude that substantial evidence supports the Commissioner's decision and that the correct law was applied. Therefore, we affirm. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED